FILE: B-212237.2 DATE: December 16, 1983

MATTER OF: Williams and Lane, Incorporated

DIGEST:

Request for reconsideration of protest decision filed more than 10 working days after protester receives decision with which it disagrees is untimely.

Williams and Lane, Incorporated (Williams and Lane), requests reconsideration of our decision, Williams and Lane, Incorporated, B-212237, October 24, 1983, 83-2 CPD 482, in which we denied that firm's protest against the proposed award of a contract to Alco Power Incorporated (Alco), under invitation for bids (IFB) No. N6247081-B-8610, issued by the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (Navy). Williams and Lane essentially disagrees with our decision.

Williams and Lane's request for reconsideration is untimely.

By letter dated November 14, 1983, Williams and Lane advised the Navy of that firm's disagreement with GAO's decision and requested that the Navy reevaluate Alco's bid. On November 21, 1983, this Office received Williams and Lane's request for reconsideration.

Our Bid Protest Procedures provide that requests for reconsideration must be received by this Office not later than 10 working days after the basis for reconsideration is or should have been known. 4 C.F.R. § 21.9(b) (1983). Since Williams and Lane's basis for requesting reconsideration is its disagreement with our October 24, 1983, decision, Williams and Lane should have filed its request for reconsideration here within 10 working days of the date Williams and Lane received our decision. While we do not know the exact date Williams and Lane received the decision, it is reasonable to assume that it was received within 1 calendar week of its issuance. Therefore, we consider Williams and Lane's request for reconsideration received in this Office on November 21, 1983 (more than 27 calendar days after issuance of our decision), untimely and not for reconsideration on the merits. C.W. Girard, C.M.--Reconsideration, B-210135.2, February 23, 1983, 83-1 CPD 186; U.S. Financial Services, Inc. -- Reconsideration, B-195945.5, B-198276.2 September 25, 1981, 81-2 CPD 249.

B-212237.2

Further, the fact that, prior to filing its request for reconsideration with this Office, Williams and Lane requested that the Navy reevaluate the proposed awardee's bid does not affect our timeliness procedures, quoted above. See Robert E. Robocker--Request for Reconsideration, B-207279.2, June 16, 1982, 82-1 CPD 596.

The request for reconsideration is dismissed.

Harry R. Van Cleve Acting General Counsel

• •